

REMARKS/ARGUMENT

Claims 2, 5-6, 12, 14, 15, and 23-25 are pending in the present application. Claims 2, 5, 12, 14, 15, 23, and 25 are currently amended. Claims 1, 3, 4, 7-11, 13, 16-22, and 26-28 have been cancelled. No new matter has been added.

Reconsideration of the claims based on the below comments is respectfully requested.

102 and 103 Rejections of Claims 1, 3, 4, 7-11, 13, 16-22, and 26-28

In the July 9, 2008 final Office action, claims 1, 3, 7-9, and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Lundsgaard US 5,564,419 ("Lundsgaard '419"). Claims 11, 13, 16-22, 26, and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Lundsgaard US 5,525,518 ("Lundsgaard '518"). Claims 4 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lundsgaard '419 in view of Lundsgaard '518.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 7-11, 13, 16-22, and 26-28 are cancelled, and thus, the rejection of these claims is rendered moot.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 2, 5-6, 12, 15, and 23-25 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were stated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Final Office Action, at ¶¶16-17.

Claims 2 and 5 have been amended to include the limitations of cancelled base independent claim 1. Claim 6 depends from amended claim 5. Claims 12 and 15 have been amended to include the limitations of cancelled base independent claim 11. Claims 23 and 25 have been amended to include the limitations of base independent claim 19. Claim 24 depends from amended claim 23. That is, claims 2, 5-6, 12, 15, and 23-25 have been amended into an allowable form in accordance with the statements in the Final Office Action.

For at least these reasons, claims 2, 5-6, 12, 15, and 23-25 should be allowed and the objection withdrawn.

Claim 14

Claim 14 has been amended to include the limitation of cancelled base independent claim 11. Claim 14 recites, *inter alia*, “at least one of forming said first format component and forming said second format component comprises molding slots into said at least one component and molding the format between first and second ribbons.”

Claim 14 was not specifically discussed in the Detailed Action section of the Final Office Action. Claim 14 includes a recitation of “molding slots into said at least one component”. The final Office action generally discusses a lack of disclosure in the prior art of slots in the format components. *See* Final Office Action, at ¶17. For at least these reasons, claim 14 should be allowed.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit that claims 2, 5-6, 12, 14, 15, and 23-25 are in condition for allowance and action toward that is respectfully requested. If there are any matters which may be resolved or clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at (312) 425-8552.

It is believed that no fees are due; however, should any fees be required (except for payment of the issue fee) or credit due, the Commissioner is authorized to deduct the fees from or issue the credit to Nixon Peabody Deposit Account No. 50-4181, Order No. 247082-000094USPX.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 9, 2008

/Peter J. Prommer, Reg. No. 54743/
Peter J. Prommer
NIXON PEABODY LLP
161 North Clark Street, 48th Floor
Chicago, IL 60601-3213
(312) 425-3900 - main
(312) 425-3909 - facsimile

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT